Accountability Work Group
Oct. 26-27, 2011
NOTES

Welcome by Secretary of Education Melody Schopp

In attendance: Rep. Jacqueline Sly, Pam Homan, Tim Mitchell, Margo Heinert, Mike Hanson, Darrell Mueller, Curt Voight, Gregg Talcott, Kevin Nelson, Chris Schultz, Kyley Cumbow, Becky Guffin, Lyn Heidenson, Susan Turnipseed, Nicole Keegan, Terri McLellan, Julie Mathiesen, Sandy Arsenault, Wade Pogany, Kim Bellum, Paul Turman

Tami Darnall, DOE – Longitudinal Data System presentation
Request to have an option for districts to have their own data added into system

Melody Schopp, DOE – Teacher Standards update
Question: Should we submit a waiver application for flexibility from ESEA?
Schopp: Could risk $100 million in federal funding if we don't.

Lennie Symes, TIE – Growth Model presentation
Two big questions: 1) How are you going to measure? 2) How much growth is enough?

LEARNINGS:
--Schools need more precise reporting especially over time
--Small schools accountable at lower levels
--Different students count for each factor: participation vs. attendance vs. graduation (each measure has a different set of kids)
--Value added growth model and linear regression – ability to do some evening out/account for some outside factors
--Some models don't focus on individual students – maybe down to school or teacher level
--Currently, way too many holes in content and grade levels

QUESTIONS:
Do we do growth over two years or longer?
How do we connect students and teachers?
What about growth within one year?
Could formative assessments be a substitute for Dakota STEP?
      Formative could be a part of bigger assessment piece. Much more validity if everyone is
      doing it – bigger numbers equal more validity.
Challenge: We need more data, but where does that data reside?
What about a model that accounts for meeting AMO or showing growth?
      It would be a more complex system but is possible.
Would growth model need to be separate for elementary, middle and high school?

Mary Stadick Smith, DOE – U.S. Ed Flexibility Package presentation

SMALL GROUP REPORTS FROM DAY ONE & DAY TWO

Group #1 -- AMO Targets
1st Report Back

--Spring to spring assessment, as long as new assessment allows for some formative assessment

--Three-tiered approach to accountability: 1) Status and 2) Growth/value-added for federal purposes

--Third tier would incorporate other pieces already being reported that indicate what makes a good school (eg., ACT or Work Keys, postsecondary remediation rate, discipline records, data from Youth Risk Behavior Survey, policies in place, etc.)

--First two tiers would determine whether a district/school makes AYP; third tier reported out on dashboard website

--For federal accountability, we limit our measures to math and reading

--For state accountability, would like to include high school end-of-course exams
--For state accountability, would like to see K-2 brought into mix – for being on track by 3rd grade

--Rubric could be developed to measure school culture with weight given to various measures. All items could be added together to arrive at an overall school (bullying policies, number of kids that go onto postsecondary, all areas that make up school culture). NOTE: Might be cumbersome and could add more reporting burden on schools

--AMOs should not differ by LEA, school or subgroup
    --No, don't want to water down the target for any kids
    --System already too complex, and this would add to complexity
    --Growth model would help to take care of those questions

This group perceives grades 3-8 is a different system than for high school.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:
Growth model has to be on individual students
How much growth is a good target? 1 year's growth
Does AMO have to be a number, or can the growth be the number?
Where is the beginning measure?
Consider several different indicators, like the KY model
Issue with attendance being part of the measure; that's one thing we don't have control over
Use unduplicated counts – students not counted in so many subgroups –addresses the issue with cells

FINAL Report Back

--Recommend spring to spring testing
      --Formative assessment is aligned to state standards
      --At a minimum, low-performing students (basic & below basic) are required to use formative assessment
      --Growth model to be determined to measure progress toward AMO

--N size should go back to 10 so that more schools are included
--Use an unduplicated count with students assigned to priority subgroup (state to set priority for subgroups)
--N = 10 at CI = 95%

--Math and reading/ELA reported to feds
--Other areas could/should be included in our state model
--Attendance should not be a reporting metric (consider other choices: retention, achievement on additional assessment, etc.)

--Recommend to choose Option C for flexibility application – create our own system

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:
Should we have differentiated n size for different size schools?
Could we go to percentages, as opposed to straight numbers for N size?

••

Group #2: Standards and Assessment
1st Report Back

--Consider a transition plan since we've got different timelines coming up (eg., flexibility in 2012-13, alternate assessment 2013-14, new Smarter Balance assessment in 2014-15)

--Assess grades 3-8 and 10&11 for accountability purposes.

--We also need something at K-2 and grades 9&12. These would be used to inform instruction, not for accountability.

--Stick with reading and math testing for accountability purposes. Some talk of having end-of-course and other assessments in place for instructional purposes and teacher performance.

--Meaningful high school assessment
      --High school should have its own system: grad rate + assessment + college/career ready

--Grades 10 and 11 tested for accountability
--Link grade 11 assessment results to college entrance
--Utilize other assessments in grades 11&12 (ASVAB, ACT, end of course)

--For ELL students, the ACCESS should be our tool for accountability, not Dakota STEP.
--Progress measured differently for each tier

--Non-duplicated count is very critical.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:
--Why need both end-of-course and state test?
--Use senior year to do remediation before they go to college.
--Could use something other than test at 11th grade? Maybe ACT or something else. Have a test at end of grade 10, so can do the remediation any sooner.
--High school is about proficiency in courses, not about grade levels. Starting at 9th grade, measure accountability by proficiency in courses.
--What about a 9th grade exam?
--Opportunity to break down the wall between high school and college.
--What relationship does ACT have in this system? Redirect current assessment dollars to paying for ACT?
--Use ACT or PLAN during the sophomore year, so can use info to inform last two years of work.
--What about ELL students or SPED students? Stop giving kids tests that have no meaning.

FINAL Report Back

High School (grades 9-12)
--For accountability purposes, give state test at grade 10.

--Prior to grade 12, choose from a menu of options to determine college/career ready:
--ASVAB
--ACT/PLAN/Work KEYS
--End of course exam package or AP exams
--Cut scores would determine readiness

--Three elements at high school and these are weighted: assessment at grade 10, the college career ready indicator (the menu), grad rate. Use this percentage to say – X percent of our students are college and career ready

--Once a student that has demonstrated that proficiency, then they don't have to go back into the mix for calculation.

--If we chose to do 9th grade, we would have to create our own test for grade 9. It is not part of SMARTER Balance.

<u>Elementary/Middle School</u>
--Grades 3-8 reading and math for accountability
--Other grade levels and content areas for informing instruction
--ELL students use ACCESS instead of Dakota STEP -- legitimate way to measure these kids
--Use of standards based report card – that would cover assessment of K-2 (because you have pre- and post-tests)
--Use a non-duplicated count!!!

■■

Group #3: Reward Group
1st Report Back

--Do not like the "Reward" title; suggest using High Performing and High Progress

--High Performing
      --All Student Group, All Subgroups and Grad Rate
      --Three years consecutively
      --Based on state assessment and 10% above AMO

--High Progress
      --All Student category, no subgroups
      --Narrowing of the achievement gap of subgroups
      --Grad rate included
      --Over three testing cycles

--No cap on number of Reward schools – you hit the mark, you are Reward school

--Title I dollars can be used to reward Title I schools, general funds for non-Title.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS
--What about those schools that are testing 100% of students vs. those testing just 25% -- such as a K-3?
--What about those districts that get high performing by default (because they have no subgroups)?
--What about N size?
--Could we have another type of High Performing – other than the federal definition? Let's go beyond.
--Federal funding for these Reward schools would come from 1003a – not regular Title

FINAL Report Back

Priority Schools – bottom 5% Title/Non-Title schools

--Spelled out in law what entails – turnaround principles

--State looking into Indistar tracking

--Data retreats

--Initial audit

--Targeted assistance – research based PD

--Unbiased 3rd party assistance

Focus Schools – next 10% of Title/Non-Title schools

--Require data Retreats

--IndiStar tracking

--Initial audit

--Targeted assistance and research based PD

High Performing characteristics:

--All Students

--All Subgroups

--Grad rate

--Three consecutive years on state assessment above AMO target by 10% (status)

High Progress characteristics:

--10% of schools

--All Students; narrow achievement gaps of subgroups

--Grad rate

--3 consecutive years

--Based on growth

Incentives

--Financial

--For both High Performing and High Progress schools

--Buildings would get monetary reward, not to individual teachers – to serve the students directly

--Minimum $ 0-100 students; 101-400; 401-700; 701+

--Must be tied to achievement! No t-shirts or pizza parties

--Non-financial/recognition: Through the media, the Legislature, banners, special seal, ads/promotions, letter from Governor, visit by Secretary of Ed, etc.

NEEDS:

Can we address/change graduation rate?

Where do we get money for non-Title Priority and Focus schools?

Assignment of fiscal incentives based on per student or school size? (Rob question)

Where do we get money for incentives for non-Title schools/districts?

Restrict use of incentive money – must be aligned to achievement

Reminder: Think about supplant/supplement issue

. . . .

Group #4: Teacher and Principal Evaluation
1st Report Back

--Used six criteria from federal waiver application

--State has identified Danielson model, so that's in place. We would have four performance levels, rather than three: Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished

--Each teacher would have two scores – one from Domain 2 and one from Domain 3.

--Student growth piece required for flexibility – so this would have to be another part of the "score"

-- Student growth piece needs to be based on standards.
    --Standards-based report card
    --This would cover all grades, content areas, covers ELL and SPED. All these areas have expected standards.

--Standards-based report card dependent on state's development of training and support around standards-based report card.

--Pre and post formative assessment to monitor growth.

--LEA would have choice to select two of the following for components of evaluation (all based on feedback to Danielson's Domains 2&3:
    --Drop-in observation – five per year (Porthan)
    --Formal evaluations – two per year
    --Parent survey/Student survey
    --Portfolio
    --Professional development plan
    --Peer review

--Weight the system 50 percent on student growth and the other 50 percent on the combination of the two options.

--Individual and aggregate scores on Domain 2&3 should determine professional development

--Establish a work group to identify and recommend principal evaluation standards and tool. Work group should include: SASD, parents, SDEA, Gregg Talcott

--State could extend the year and fund statewide five days of focused PD for teachers to learn all aspects of model. (Another option: Lessen number of minutes in school year, five less days for just one year to do this training.)

Statewide standards-based report card – all content areas, all grade levels -- but still tied to a grade at least for a while – and then phase out

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:
--Standards based is more consistent. It's a yes/no – either you mastered it or not. Once you have shifted to the standards, it's much clearer for parents.

--State would have to pick the essential standards for report card – the "power standards." State would make the decision as to which are the essential. Those districts doing standards based right now use about 12 or 13 standards.

--What is the measure? It would be the pre and post assessment in a teacher's class.

--How does this come together as the two scores to become the teachers' score?

--We've got to grow the educators coming out of teacher prep, and move them in this direction. That's where the change is going to come.

--Questions about the 50-50 weighting. Melody: It's not based on a test score; it's based on growth from pre to post assessment. It's growth, not test score.

--Maybe we don't weight the two 50-50 scores … if we don't have to.

--Make this system easy. Don't make it more difficult for teachers – keep it easy. It needs to be turn-key for teachers!

--What about principals? Principal would have to use overall student growth, school community/climate, etc.

FINAL Report Back

--System needs to be statewide and include all districts – LEA can expand to include more than the two domains if they would like

--Same Report Card across the state

--Student growth based on teacher formative assessment – pre and post

--Crossed out the weighting when group came back (the 50-50%)

    --Each teacher has two total scores – one from Domain 2 and one from Domain 3

    --Group outlined as follows:

    DOMAIN 2 Total

    25%   a. Creating an environment of respect

    25%   b. Establishing a culture for learning

    25%   c. Managing classroom procedures

    25%   d. Managing student behavior

    DOMAIN 3 Total

    25%   a. Communicating with students

    25%   b. Using questioning and discussion techniques

    25%   c. Engaging students in learning

    25%   d. Using assessment in instruction

--Offered timeline for training

    --2011-12 and/or 2012-13 -- Fund teacher/administrator work groups to figure out the statewide standards based report card

    --2013-14 and/or 2014-15 – Two-year state mandate – each year 80 hours less student contact time for:

        --Teacher training on evaluation model

        --Teacher training on standards based report card

        --Administrator training on evaluation model

        --Administrator training on standards based report card

--Group identified critical needs:

    --Online system for standards based report card

    --Statewide campaign to inform parents/community re: standards based

    --Online system to report evaluation scores

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

--Discussion about the need to demonstrate student growth – feds will not accept a model that does not include significant factor of student growth. Have to assign some measure to student growth. Probably pre and post test.

--Each teacher could have a growth score and a domain score, but there has to be a measure of student growth.

--Does the state create the pre and post tests but not collect that information? So there's consistency statewide.

--Don't separate growth from Domain 2&3 total. Weight student growth into the list of the 8 observable components.

--Test weighting should be minimal.

--The summative test has nothing to do with the teacher performance piece.

--Solution: Let's create a benchmark test – in the state-run South Dakota Assessment Portal – that might help with this piece.